

TTWG COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 30, 2002

Attending: Nathan Bentley, Larry Brotman, Dave Christianson, Tanna Dole, Gail Ewart, Liza Fox, Tracy Fuller, John Gibson, Wendy Hawley, Jim Hill, Jim Mangan, Donna Phillips, and Dirk Roeller.

1. Approve last meeting minutes: Approved.
2. Transportation Business Needs and Stakeholders:

Clarification of where we were going with the Business Needs was asked. The group agreed that identify the business needs for entities that use transportation data would be valuable, but this could require a lot of time and resources to collect. Initial the main point of this section would be to identify the very commonly needs people have for this type of data. The benefit of collecting Business needs has two goals first is to assist us in identifying a beginning point for the I-plan and to help the committee establish which data needs should be should be first. Simply put it would give us some direction. Second it will assist in answering the questions of "Where are we and where are we going?" and "What do we need to get there?". It is understood that this list will not contain all the business needs for every entity and will have to be modified over time.

Tasks Being Worked On:

Tracy will work on a compilation of business needs from the state and federal levels. Tanna will work on a compilation of business needs from a local level. Liza and Dave will work on a compilation of stakeholders.

3. Review and approve modifications to TTWG Outline:

Under the TTWG Group Vision section there was a lot of discussion about what our definition of a vision was and should we add this section into the I-plan. Dave asked whether we should write the vision or wait and get further direction from the IGC. There was the question of whether the vision was of why we were writing the plan or if it was a vision of the end product? As the discussion ensued four different directions emerged:

- 1) Is this a vision for the TTWG group?
- 2) Is this a vision in the introduction of the I-Plan?
- 3) Is this a vision of the expectations of the I-Plan?
- 4) Is this a vision for the framework data sets?

Liza stated that one of the specific tasks for the TWG would be to help write the vision for their specific areas of the I-plan. The IGC has not yet established the Vision for the entire I-Plan and that would be done at a later date. It was decided that we would include a "Vision" section in the plan and that it would be limited to the expressing the intent of the TTWG's portion of the I-plan.

The group discussion then went to the identification of how we should identify "Stakeholders". It was suggested and agreed that we should take a three tiered approach by having active contributors, data attribute contributors, and end users.

Tasks Being Worked On:

Gail will take a crack at defining the players generally speaking. Dave will be looking into how the other TWG groups are identifying its stakeholders. It will be important to keep this consistent throughout the TWGs.

Contributions by Sector was deleted and it was felt that this information will be covered in Status and in Maintenance Process and Cost.

In Status we should include the current contributors. In the Estimate of Investments Needed to Complete This Theme section there was a lot of discussion about not being able to currently tackling this section. It was decided that we would express this section initial in general terms and later refine it as more information an time became available.

We agreed to add a "Risk Analysis" section after the "Implementation Strategy" section. The intent of this section will be to out line what the Risk is if Idaho does not implement the I-plan, the risk of participating, etc.

Further discussion will be need on the section "Multi-level implementation strategy based on investment." The question arose; do we want to base it solely on investment? Discussion ensued as to how to prioritize and this led back to business needs.

Most Appropriate Data Steward for transportation. The question was asked as to how the other TWG were dealing with this area? Should it one government agency statewide or something else? Hydrology was looking at be watershed area. Cadastral was doing it at a state and local level. Each working group was dealing with it a little differently. For transportation it appears that we may have a multi-level approach (yet to be describe) with one state wide agency acting an overall coordinating body. Who the data stewards(s) should be would become clearer as the Implementation and Maintenance Process was better described.

4. Get volunteers to assist in writing the rough draft of the TTWG's I-plan based in the outline. Liza, Gail, Dave, Donna, and Tracy volunteered.

5. Next Meeting will be December 5, 2002 at 8:30 Pacific Time/ 9:30 Boise Time